



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/029,667	10/22/2001	Joshua Miles Chase	CIS01-05(3847)	5068

7590 02/06/2006

Barry W. Chapin, Esq.
CHAPIN & HUANG, L.L.C.
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, MA 01581

EXAMINER

LESNIEWSKI, VICTOR D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 02/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/029,667		CHASE ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Victor Lesniewski		2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 19-31 and 37-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 19-31 and 37-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed 11/18/2005 has been placed of record in the file.
2. No claims have been amended.
3. Claims 39 and 40 have been added.
4. Claims 1-13, 19-31, and 37-40 are now pending.
5. The applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13, 19-31, 37, and 38 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. A detailed discussion is set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-12, 19-30, 37, and 38 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau (U.S. Patent Number 6,505,240) as presented in the previous action dated 8/17/2005.
8. Claims 13 and 31 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau in view of Shuster (U.S. Patent Number 6,763,379) as presented in the previous action dated 8/17/2005.
9. Claims 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blumenau in view of Subramaniam et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,081,900), hereinafter referred to as Subramaniam.

Art Unit: 2152

10. Blumenau disclosed a system for providing different sets of content from a content providing site to content display sites using a plurality of proxy content providing sites. In an analogous art, Subramaniam disclosed a system for providing both secure and non-secure content from a target server to an external client in a secure fashion using a proxy server.

11. Concerning claims 39 and 40, Blumenau did not explicitly disclose that the redirection command include addresses of both the secondary and initial content, a name of the initial content, and a delimiter as recited in the claims. However, this format was well known in the art as evidenced by Subramaniam's redirection command which includes all of these characteristics as claimed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Blumenau by adding the ability for the redirection command to include addresses of both the secondary and initial content, a name of the initial content, and a delimiter as provided by Subramaniam. Here the combination satisfies the need for a content provision system that enables providers to tailor the content being provided in accordance with characteristics of anticipated observers. See Blumenau, column 2, lines 23-28.

12. Thereby, the combination of Blumenau and Subramaniam discloses:

- <Claims 39 and 40>

The method of claim 5 wherein the redirection command including the identity of secondary content includes: (i) an address of the secondary content, the address of secondary content representing a location of the secondary content source; (ii) a name of the initial content; (iii) an address of the initial content, the address of the initial content representing a location of the initial content source; and (iv) a delimiter separating the

address of the secondary content from the name of the initial content and the address of the initial content (Subramaniam, column 7, lines 1-67).

Since the combination of Blumenau and Subramaniam discloses all of the above limitations, claims 39 and 40 are rejected.

Response to Arguments

13. In the remarks, the applicant has argued:

- <Argument 1>

Blumenau does not disclose the features of claim 1 because he does not disclose any of the limitations as recited in the claim.

- <Argument 2>

Blumenau does not disclose the features of claim 3 because he does not disclose any of the limitations as recited in the claim.

- <Argument 3>

There is no motivation to combine Blumenau and Shuster.

14. In response to argument 1, it is noted that the applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the reference. The applicant refutes the rejection of claim 1, but has set forth no discussion of why he believes the claims to be distinguished over Blumenau. The applicant states that "the examiner acknowledges Blumenau has not explicitly disclosed providing the redirection information to the requesting devices," but then has failed to take into

consideration the discussion concerning the rejection of obviousness over Blumenau.

Furthermore, the applicant has not addressed the line citations to Blumenau in the rejection making it unclear why he believes the claim to be patentable. Thus, the applicant's argument 1 is not persuasive. It is maintained that Blumenau discloses all the limitations of claim 1 as discussed in the previous action dated 8/17/2005.

15. In response to argument 2, it is noted that the applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the reference. The applicant refutes the rejection of claim 3, but has set forth no discussion of why he believes the claims to be distinguished over Blumenau. The applicant has simply restated the claim and said that "Blumenau discloses hand off instructions including timing instructions," but then has failed to make any suggestion as to how the current invention is different from Blumenau. Furthermore, the applicant has not addressed the line citations to Blumenau in the rejection making it unclear why he believes the claim to be patentable. Thus, the applicant's argument 2 is not persuasive. It is maintained that Blumenau discloses all the limitations of claim 3 as discussed in the previous action dated 8/17/2005.

16. In response to argument 3, it is maintained that motivation exists to combine Blumenau and Shuster. The applicant states that "there is no basis or factor to combine the teachings of Blumenau and Shuster," but then has failed to address the motivation presented in the previous action. It is maintained that Blumenau provides sufficient motivation to combine the references as he states the need for a content provision system that enables providers to tailor the content being provided in accordance with characteristics of anticipated observers. In this case,

Art Unit: 2152

Shuster's ability to initiate content provisions based on elapsed time measures is a characteristic which would further allow the tailoring of content provisions in Blumenau's system. See paragraph 12 of the previous action dated 8/17/2005.

17. In addition, the applicant has argued that claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103, but not explicitly discussed, are allowable based on the above arguments. Thus, claims disclosing similar limitations to the discussed claims and related dependent claims remain rejected under the same reasoning as presented above.

Conclusion

18. The applicant's amendment necessitated the new grounds of rejection presented in this office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). The applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2152

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor Lesniewski whose telephone number is 571-272-3987.


The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571-272-3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Victor Lesniewski
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2152



BUNJOB JAROENCHONWANIT
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER